



MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Public Involvement & Communications Committee (PIC)

February 4, 2020

Richland, WA

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| Topics in this Meeting Summary |
|---------------------------------------|

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Opening..... | 2 |
| Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar Update..... | 2 |
| Regional HAB Meeting | 3 |
| Preserving Photos and Data | 4 |
| Principles for Effective Public Involvement – Annual TPA Public Involvement Survey (Part 1 of 4)..... | 5 |
| Hanford Regional Dialogue | 8 |
| Public Comments and Questions at HAB Meetings | 9 |
| HAB Member Self-Assessments | 9 |
| Open Forum | 10 |
| Committee Business..... | 10 |
| Attachments | 10 |
| Attendees | 11 |

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.</i> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Opening

Jeff Burrigh, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) and PIC Chair, opened the meeting and welcomed committee members and others attending the meeting. Introductions of all participants were made.

The Committee adopted the September and December 2019 PIC meeting summaries. Prior to adoption, there was a discussion about the format of the two summaries, one of which contained portions that document committee discussion as like a transcript and one of which provided a narrative summary of committee discussions. Members generally preferred the transcript format and liked having meeting recordings. Robin Whitney, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) contracting, explained that templates and transcripts for meeting summaries and audio recordings for meetings are not currently included in the facilitation contract. She invited committee members to send requests for changes in the facilitation contract to JoLynn Garcia, DOE.

Jim Lynch, DOE, announced that the HAB committee meeting week in March has been changed from the week of March 9th to the week of March 16th.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar Update

Jen Colborn, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), reviewed the formatting changes to the two-page TPA Public Involvement Calendar¹. She walked through the items on the current public involvement calendar, including:

- 60-Day Comment Period (Dec 16-Feb 14) Integrated Disposal Facility – Class 3 permit modification
- 60-Day Comment Period (Jan 13-Mar 13) Training Inspection Plan – Class 2 permit modification
- 45-Day Comment Period (Feb 3-Mar 19) Liquid Effluent Retention Facility and Effluent Treatment Facility – Class 3 permit modification
- 45-Day Comment Period (Feb 10-Mar25) Operating Details to Support Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) Facility and Effluent Management Facility – Class 3 permit modification
- 45-Day Comment Period (Feb 10-Mar 25) Hanford Emergency Management Plan – Class 3 permit modification
- 45-Day Comment Period (Feb 24-Apr 9) Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plan Risk Assessment Permit Modification
- 45-Day Comment Period (Mar 16-May 1) Closure Plans at T-Plant and the Central Waste Complex – Class 3 permit modification
- 30-Day Comment Period (Spring 2020) 200-BP-5 and 200-PO-1 Proposed Plan for Interim Action Remediation

Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) explained that the Proposed Plan for 200-BP-5 and 200-PO-1 requires EPA Headquarters review. Her current estimate was that it would be out in March or April 2020.

Committee members asked the facilitation team to share information on the 45-Day Comment Period for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plan Risk Assessment with the Tank Waste Committee.

Emy Laija announced that the week of March 23, senior EPA staff from Washington, DC will be at Hanford for two to three days doing site tours. There is an opportunity for the public to interact with EPA

¹ [Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar](#)

staff. She asked if there would be public interest in an event of some type. Committee members made the following suggestions and observations:

- Local leaders might set something up for a session with the public.
- It would be good to explain what EPA does, especially what the agency does locally with Hanford cleanup. Include big posters showing EPA's responsibilities.
- This is a great opportunity.
- Get the word out ahead of time to help people know why engaging is worthwhile. Maybe the *Tri-City Herald* would be interested in publishing an article.

Ginger Wireman, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said that Ecology could help with social media for the event.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: "Is the only place the document [TPA Public Involvement Calendar] goes to is the Board?"

R: "It is on the Hanford website."

C: "I love the back page [of the TPA Public Involvement Calendar]. I don't know who suggested this, but it is the best idea yet."

The committee asked that copies of the TPA Public Involvement Calendar be available at the HAB meeting the next day, in part, because of their appreciation of the clear chart on the back identifying the various laws governing Hanford cleanup and agency responsibilities with respect to each law.

Regional HAB Meeting

JoLynn Garcia explained that DOE was unable to support a HAB meeting in Seattle in April 2020. There is interest in a regional HAB meeting being held in a location near one of the tribes represented on the HAB, perhaps in June or September 2020. She noted that DOE needs to make sure that there is adequate attendance at a regional HAB meeting to support the expense.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions (Q), comments (C), and agency responses (R).

C: "Last time we shared we weren't sure if we were going to be able to support the Seattle meeting. At some of the meetings, I have heard some folks saying they would like to go to the HAB meeting at one of our tribe groups, so I reached out and talked to Karen Lutz, and Greg Phillips who works with the tribal folks. They are starting some meetings next week to talk to the tribal folks. There are different things we need for a venue. We will have our June meeting and September meeting so I think one or the other would be a good opportunity. See if we could do a HAB meeting there, so we move the meetings around the regional ones. We don't want to invite ourselves. We want to make sure EPA and Ecology like the idea."

C: "You have sovereign nation to sovereign nation and negotiation between the tribes, and if this is the case and if bringing in the HAB is appropriate in this situation."

C: "I just want to make sure that the Tri-Party agencies like the idea as well as the PIC. I think it's a good idea we develop some of the briefings."

C: "If we are going to have a regional HAB meeting, we might want to think about the time for discussion, and we may want to discuss with the hosts."

C: "I am curious if that's even possible for a HAB meeting. I appreciate you looking into it. I would love for us to do that if the tribe would be okay with that."

C: "There is a difference in the opening and closing the session. The timing for public comment tends to broaden."

C: "If any of the tribes decline, are there other possibilities like Spokane if Seattle is too expensive?"

C: "A lot of people enjoyed Hood River. And getting the right price at Hood River, we have to maybe next year as we are working on our workshop. We look at what days and month."

R: "We have heard that. We are definitely working to see when we can make those times work and when the appropriate times are. I'm trying to work across - I'm at both offices. However, we are working with both offices now, so I think being able to talk to all different groups and saying what public comment is coming out, we have got to try to get peoples input. Getting people to respond to these surveys. Maybe ProSidian can help us get something together on who is planning on coming."

C: "I think the Regional Dialogue is more important than the HAB Board."

R: "I want to make sure the information we're bringing to you is exciting and that you're learning from it and understand. I'm listening to what the HAB members have to say. It's not always in the written advice we get from you but in the discussions."

C: "I think that's worth considering that there might be more interest in the Regional Dialogue for the tribes."

C: "We have some good pictures of before and after cleanup. We can design some of those updates to be more interesting for the regional we are going to. It's good that we are talking about this now. And to further digest this, it seems to me that the advantage that a HAB regional meeting, it would be greater value to have the board meeting where you are trying to recruit people onto the HAB."

C: "I think the regional HAB with the tribe is inappropriate, I believe a joint call so it's not all just one sided."

Preserving Photos and Data

Jeff Burright introduced Ben Ellison, DOE, by posing the question of what happens with the files and photos when contracts change. Ken Niles, ODOE, had raised some questions about locating photographs when the contract with Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) ended.

Ben Ellison explained that WCH had its own network that was separate from the Hanford computer network. The WCH network and the information it contained has been archived. All of the official

records from the WCH network were brought into the current Hanford network. For WCH data that is not an official record, that information can be accessed, although it requires bringing the whole system back to life. This is a unique issue to WCH and not to other contractors.

Ben noted that there are three pillars of cyber security: confidentiality, integrity, and availability. The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) sets the rules for record retention. Ben is concerned with the move from paper records to electronic records and in what format those records need to be kept that will remain good over long periods of time such that the records can be effectively retrieved in the future.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: “How convinced are you that the record documents are all there, and everything is retrievable?”

R: “There are three pillars of cyber security. This is a record no one can get into and change it. Yes, I am confident all the records came over. That was one of the things we checked and double checked.”

Q: “Is there anyone making sure it can be reproduced in the future?”

R: “They are using sapphire based storage. Most of our stuff is on actual hard drives. It’s like a biological system. There is some information we have on a long-term tape that was written dozens and dozens of years ago.”

Principles for Effective Public Involvement – Annual TPA Public Involvement Survey (Part 1 of 4)

Jeff Burright introduced this discussion by explaining the need to look forward in light of what has happened in the past, the changing nature of public involvement, and the growing national profile of Hanford. The discussion at this meeting is to look at the TPA public involvement survey that has been done for a number of years.

Ginger Wireman provided a handout with information on all the TPA public involvement surveys since 2012. The first year the survey was conducted online was in 2012 using Survey Monkey. In 2012-2014, there were 160-170 responses a year. Then it started to drop off. For the 2018 survey, there were only 55 participants. There is a concern that if people are not taking the survey, it is not providing value. The TPA agencies have a lot of feedback where people complained about things. However, the responses have not been very diverse. We want to know why people do not participate in the Hanford process, but the survey is pretty much only going to people that know that Hanford exists.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: “If no one is taking the survey, I don’t know what we get from it. These also have lessons learned and over the years, one thing we have seen is we’re doing better job on fact sheets over time.”

C: “We want to know why people don’t participate in the Hanford process and this survey is pretty much only going to people that know Hanford exist. Before 2012 we handed out surveys, but Survey Monkey is easy to do. I don’t know whether we’re asking the questions we really want answers to and if there’s a different way to track a different audience to figure out why we don’t get new people.”

C: "Maybe people are getting survey fatigue because it's the same people filling it out and not having clear sense of what is done with the survey."

C: "Most people who have high schoolers still don't talk to their kids about Hanford."

C: "People think we have power production nuclear waste."

Q: "It's an interesting point. You're already asking insiders that have awareness of Hanford about the public process. How aware are people? Is there a method where people tend to become more aware of Hanford?"

Q: "Why should I care? How does this affect me?"

C: "I teach my kids, and they want to know about what they can do, and I tell them to share with someone at home - just talk to each other about Hanford's existence. It's a powerful social process to get change initiated in our space."

C: "Looking at 2015 pages, just want to observe on question number 15. The input 174 answers and 28% agreed and 37 disagreed. Thirty-four were neutral. The small number that shows up feels that showing up doesn't make any difference. Look at demographics. It's overwhelming white and older. If there were to be further surveys, and take the info we already have and use it to redesign outreach and see if those fixes worked."

Q: "Re-designing? Are there surveys for Regional Dialogue?"

R: "Yes, people who attended it. Or no, it was for Hanford Live. It would be interesting and compelling with the design of it. How to pay for advertising online."

C: "I have a laundry list of ideas. KING 5 news gets a lot of press on Hanford. Build on the interest from those kinds of stories might be interesting to find. We have a reporter who comes to our meetings and interesting articles that come into the Bellingham. I just now heard that we set out surveys at the public meetings. The "frog" survey system and do survey on people's computers that they would be happy to answer. What can we do to reach the people who don't know anything about Hanford?"

C: "Last week I was working on lateral flow white paper. I stumbled across a Washington map. If someone had said take a survey about what you learned, I would have been more engaged in filling out a survey because I just learned. If there was a way to tap into people's first stops on the road to knowledge of Hanford and introduce them to informational material, it may be a way to get people involved. I've noticed the newspapers have taken away the comment section."

C: "I've advocated for story mapping for a while, too. Hanford would be perfect for a place for story maps."

C: "Ginger has been working on a Hanford story map from the pre-1940s to beginning of the Tri-Party Agreement."

C: "We have an interactive map and can zoom in and get 324 building. Still being cleaned up."

Q: "Are you going to bring it to the Board/PIC before [making the interactive map on the Ecology website] live?"

R: "I don't see why not. Before we publish it, we [Ecology] can share with you guys and get input, too."

Q: "Are we talking about the survey or using Ginger's analysis of the survey to talk about public involvement? We need to keep in mind the purpose of the survey. The general feedback, was to get an idea on what happened. We need more tailored questions."

Q: "What is the value of the survey as of now? There might be concern about the value of the survey."

R: "I [Ecology] host it, compile it, Emy [Laija] drafted lessons learned. We can make a shorter survey of some of the questions over the past 10 years."

C: "In the near time, we need to get a different subset of different responses, and we need to educate and go where they are. Engineers Week is every February. We went to the high schools but didn't really educate about Hanford that much. Give a short here's Hanford and here's a survey, but connect it to some place they already know so you have a shot in peaking their interest."

C: "If the objective is to try to find survey subjects that have never answered questions before, we don't have to take out any important questions. Get as much information on the same data as we can. You're going to find people who just learned something about Hanford and might want to respond. People take those tours, and they are always popular and filled up. Get something in their hands, and now that you've seen this, see the reaction to what you have learned."

Q: "Where do we go from here? The next [PIC] meeting, we want to do a look back. Ask everyone here to read old advice and think about the context and see if there are any connections we can drop and bring into next meeting that are fruitful."

C: "I did have a thought. Maybe the focus of last year shouldn't be the main thing. If we are willing to put off getting results back until May or June, we could have computers available at the Hanford Health & Safety Expo and have people take them as they are leaving. Maybe we can add a few more questions."

C: "I think we don't necessarily need the individual survey but maybe different ways to tackle it. I think it is dynamic. Questions have tweaked overtime. One thing I would recommend is moving forward in thinking about ways the HAB affects public involvement. One thing you might want to do is ask about specific mechanisms. What are Hanford types of tools? Story maps, story of DFLAW. There are ways to think about those things, too. How to reach new audience? There are workforce demographics, so there are bits we can take along the way."

C: "Maybe do a random one-question poll, like twitter."

C: "In classes, we regularly use Hanford videos so there are short little bits and are good at starting the conversation. Oftentimes, I will play Hanford story clips and compare the way stories are showed."

C: “I would add this is a society-wide problem: the question of how you get information into the public. Be thoughtful of who’s important to target and why.”

C: “Such as the news that it’s going to cost \$7 billion and why is that important.”

The discussion wrapped up with reminders that it is the responsibility of Board members to reach back and communicate what they have learned to the people and organizations they represent. Likewise, it is their responsibility to share the messages and concerns from the group’s Board members represent with the HAB and the TPA agencies.

Next Steps:

Jeff Burrigh reviewed the purpose of this topic which was a proposed starting point to this series of discussions to shine a light on the public involvement principles developed 10 years ago. At the next PIC meeting, the committee will take a look back. Members were asked to read the old HAB advice, think about the context, and see what connections they can bring to the next meeting for further discussion.

Hanford Regional Dialogue

Jeff Burrigh introduced this topic by explaining that the purpose of the discussion was to figure out the when and whereof the next Hanford Regional Dialogue. He invited Yvonne Levardi, DOE, to share a DOE perspective.

Yvonne Levardi said that DOE likes the format and is open to changes to find what works best for everybody. DOE believes it is good for all of the senior management to be there to present information first-hand. DOE is thinking about two events a year.

Randy Bradbury, Ecology, explained that Ecology is not in love with the current format. In the past, the topics started in the weeds and got “weedier”. Ecology does not believe that the current format is reaching out to the folks who aren’t coming to the event. Randy agreed that two events a year is realistic, including one on the west side of the state of Washington.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: “I just wanted to say, it’s not coming to Seattle. We were planning our syllabus around it. We were putting effort in planning in advance. We haven’t had a Seattle meeting in a really long time. April is the only time that will work for the UW [University of Washington]. Just the timing for the students.”

C: “My thought is encouraging us to think outside the box, looking at the format again. Uncomplicate how many people need to be there. I would love to hear some thoughts on how we could try smaller, general conversations.”

C: “This is how in the more distant past, how we did it. There was room for pre-workshops so people could come in with multiple perspectives. This is what the public interest groups used to do. If the public interest groups are going to be involved, that’s how it can be done, but that requires a degree of coordination. There are gains and losses from this kind of format.”

R: “Our goal is to communicate with the general public, rather than narrow it down. Don’t take me wrong. I understand where everyone is coming from, but I know what we did in the past was different, but budget money we can use for events like this keeps shrinking.”

C: “I was thinking if we knew the dates in advance, then we could get the topics. There is something always happening at Hanford. It would take some planning.”

C: “North Seattle Community College - there might be some options to open it up and to involve students. In order to broaden the meetings, it’s necessary to a degree to target young people. That’s a group that’s not showing up and to kind of cater to them.”

C: “The where and the when seems to be up in the air. We have had a meeting in Hood River and the Tri-Cities. I would like to see a metropolitan area.”

R: “I think there is a general willingness and agreement that Seattle would be better and soon.”

C: “It is helpful to have the managers there - having decision makers be able to share their process as much as they can.”

The conversation ended with a brief discussion of possible locations, including Seattle, Olympia, and Salem, partly because of the proximity of Olympia and Salem to state legislatures.

Public Comments and Questions at HAB Meetings

Jeff Burright framed this discussion topic by asking how can we make it clearer what the purpose is of the public comment periods at HAB meetings. The issue comes up when people ask questions during the public comment period. The PIC discussed this a little on its last committee conference call. Ideas included putting instructions and guidelines near the microphone where people speak and having a script that the HAB chair could read.

HAB Member Self-Assessments

The following items were shared during this discussion:

- There seems to be interest in the news that Energy Northwest wants to build a small reactor.
- Helen Wheatley is phasing out as a representative for Heart of America Northwest. Amber Waldref is phasing in. She has been on the HAB before.
- I have been asked how to tell the story of Hanford to Montessori children in a way they will feel safe and can learn something about Hanford. Suggestions included:
 - Talking to Montessori teachers about their teaching methodology,
 - Making cookies and pretending that the flour is like contamination that you don’t want to get on yourself, and
 - Imagining that a crack in a sidewalk is dangerous, and what kind of area could you put around it to stop someone from tripping on it and getting hurt.
- There is more awareness of the tanks and underground storage.
- There is a conference at Oregon State University in August. It seems like there will be a lot of things happening around the region for the Hanford anniversary.
- I have been working on how to translate some things for the public.

- If PIC members know of schools where Ecology could make presentations, Ecology staff is excited to do that.

Open Forum

Committee members expressed disappointment in not having a currently-planned Hanford Regional Dialogue event. Some believe that more open-ended conversations are what make public involvement successful, although it can be stressful or frustrating to try and do something new.

Another topic was the TPA public involvement survey. The survey focuses on the people who are attending meetings and not the people who are in the area, have interest, but cannot attend the meetings. Who are the people who did not go to a meeting because it wasn't convenient?

A third topic was around recruiting members for the HAB and the limitation on alternate members. In the past, a seat was allowed two alternate members. Most seats are now limited to one alternate.

The discussion wrapped up with the creation of an Issue Manager team to work on the series of conversations on the Principles for Effective Public Involvement. Jeff Burright and Liz Mattson volunteered. Helen Wheatly asked that a seat on the team be held for someone from Heart of America Northwest, although she was unsure who that would be yet.

Committee Business

Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, reminded the committee that they needed to select a chair and vice chair in the spring. Most committees do this at their March meetings. She recommended that PIC do this at the April meeting. She suggested that nominations for chair and vice chair be sent to the facilitation team no later than March 25, since the agenda and meeting materials for the April PIC meeting need to be distributed on April 1.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions (Q), comments (C), and agency responses (R).

Q: "Is there a timeline for when the paper work will be done for new [HAB] members?"

R: "We [DOE] submitted the packages already. Following up in March."

Attachments

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar

Attachment 2: PIC Committee 3-Month Work Plan

Attachment 3: 2020 April Potential Committee Meeting Topics

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Susan Leckband, Member | Jacob Reynolds, Alternate | Jan Catrell, Member |
| Helen Wheatley, Member | Dan Solitz, Member | Rebecca Holland, Member |
| Jeff Burright, Member | Shannon Cram, Member (phone) | Liz Mattson, Member (phone) |

Others:

| | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Jim Lynch, DOE | Robin Whitney, DOE | Ryan Miller, Ecology |
| JoLynn Garcia, DOE | Ginger Wireman, Ecology | Jennifer Colborn, MSA |
| Coleen Drinkard, MSA | Ashley Herring, ProSidian | Jasmine Martinez, ProSidian |
| Adrian Woolcock, ProSidian | Ruth Nicholson, ProSidian | |